

REMARKS

Claims 2-5 and 7-17 are pending in the present application. By this reply, claims 1 and 6 have been cancelled and new claims 14-17 have been added. Claims 2, 5, 9, 12 and 13 are independent.

The specification and claims have been amended to clarify the invention and to correct minor informalities according to U.S. patent practice. These modification are fully supported by the original disclosure and do not add new matter. For instance, new claims 14-16 are supported by Figure 2 and new claim 17 is supported by, e.g., page 10, line 19 - page 11, line 5 of the original specification. In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Disclosure Objection

The disclosure has been objected because of informalities. These informalities have been corrected as suggested by the Examiner. Thus this objection should be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph, Rejection

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This claims has been amended to overcome this rejection and thus the rejection should be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102 & § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-5, 7 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cowart. Claims 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cowart in view of Park (U.S. 2003/0039241 A1) and Traversat (U.S. 2002/0184311 A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park (U.S. 2003/0039241 A1). Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cowart in view of Park (U.S. 2003/0039241 A1) and Rosen

(U.S. 20020173327 A1). These rejections, insofar as they pertain to the presently pending claims, are respectfully traversed.

Regarding independent claim 2, the claimed invention relates to a service method which is capable of receiving open information stored in a mobile terminal and displaying the received open information on a screen of another mobile terminal. That is, the service method of a mobile terminal according to the claimed invention comprises receiving open information stored in a first mobile terminal and transmitted by the first mobile terminal to a second mobile terminal through a wireless communication network, and displaying the received open information on a screen of the second mobile terminal, wherein the open information stored in the first mobile terminal is selected by a user of the second mobile terminal. Therefore, mobile terminal users according to the claimed invention are capable of obtaining various information (i.e., open information) stored in one mobile terminal, on a screen of another mobile terminal. Other independent claims recite similar features in a varying scope.

These features are neither taught nor rendered obvious by Cowart alone or in combination with the applied secondary reference(s). Cowart discloses a method of sharing drives in a network and a method of sending data to a shared printer through a peer-to-peer network. However, Cowart does not teach or suggest the first and second mobile terminals which allow the open information of the second mobile terminal to be displayed on the first mobile terminal, where the open information stored in the first mobile terminal is selected by a user of the second mobile terminal.

The other applied references such as Park, Traversat, Rosen, etc. do not overcome the deficiencies of Cowart. For instance, Park merely discloses providing a connection between IP address and telephone number on the Internet network offering Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) services and connecting to Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN). Traversat merely discloses a peer computing system comprising a subset of the peer nodes configured to participate in a peer discovery protocol to discover other peer nodes, and a subset of the peer

nodes configured to participate in a peer membership protocol for joining or forming a peer group with other peer nodes. Rosen merely discloses transmitting and receiving packet information using Internet protocol (IP), such as a Code Division Multiple Access (CDMA) system, a Time Division Multiple Access (TDMA) system, a Global System for Mobile Communications (GSM) system, etc. Therefore, Cowart alone or in combination with the applied secondary reference(s) fails to teach or suggest at least the above noted features recited in each independent claim.

Furthermore, independent claims 5 and 13, for example, recite the use of a phone number of the second mobile terminal to connect. Cowart is directed to Windows 95, which is not suitable for a mobile terminal such as a mobile phone. Thus, it is not obvious to one skilled in the art to apply some of the teachings pertaining to the mobile phone technology to Cowart's system.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, the invention as recited in amended independent claims 2, 5, 9 and 12-13, and dependent claims 3-4, 7-8 and 10-11 (due to their dependency) is patentable over the applied prior art of record, including the cited references, and thus the Examiner's rejections should be withdrawn.

It is also note that claim 11 is allowable since claim 11 has not been rejected over any prior art of record.


Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons and in view of the above clarifying amendments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw all of the objections and rejections of record, and an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Should there be any matters which need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Esther H. Chong (Registration No. 40,953) at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

Dated: May 7, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Esther H. Chong

Registration No.: 40,953

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant